UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,393	10/20/2003	William C. Dodge	BOE.100/02-12538	3751

	EXAMINER
55132 7590 03/20/2007 WILDMAN HARROLD ALLEN & DIXON LLP AND THE BOEING COMPANY 225 W. WACKER DR. CHICAGO, IL 60606	REYES, MARIELA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/690,393	DODGE, WILLIAM C.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mariela D. Reyes	2167	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 October 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/07/2004</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The instant claim recites "**...reformat the plurality of tables...**" examiner suggests that it should be changed, for clarifying purposes, so that the claim reads "**...reformat the data in the plurality of tables...**"

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: The instant claim is missing a word "**...assembling the into data...**" should say "**...assembling the data into data...**".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa et al (US Patent 5,608,874).

With respect to independent claim 1, Ogawa teaches:

A method for providing data to a software application comprising the steps of:

Assembling the data into a plurality of tables (data file); (Column 10 Lines 52-56, discloses data being manually entered into a database)

Providing the plurality of tables (data file) to a memory (Outgoing Data Box) accessible by a server; (Column 10 Lines 64-66, discloses loading the data file into the Outgoing Data Box that is going to be accessed by the server)

Sending a request, from a client to the server, to reformat the data in the plurality of tables; (Column 11 Lines 17-23, discloses invoking the data transmission and reformatting process)

Receiving the plurality of tables at the server in response to the server receiving the request to reformat the plurality of tables; (Column 11 Lines 42-50, discloses transmitting the information from the client to the server)

Reformatting, at the server, the data in the plurality of tables to a reformatted form according to rules of the software application; (Column 2 Lines 58-59, discloses translating the data to the specific format needed by the software application) **and**

Entering the data in the reformatted form in a database. (Column 23 Lines 56-62, discloses storing the formatted data in a database)

With respect to claim 2, Ogawa teaches:

The step of assembling the data into the plurality of tables comprises assembling the data at the client into the plurality of tables (data file) (Column 10 Lines 52-56, discloses data being manually entered into a database) **wherein at least**

one of the plurality of tables is formatted in a one-to-one relationship. (Column 10

Lines 59-61, discloses a field being uniquely representative to each other field)

With respect to claim 3, Ogawa teaches:

The step of assembling comprises creating each of the plurality of tables

in respective spreadsheets (Column 8 Lines 28-39, discloses using a spreadsheet for

assembling the plurality of tables), **wherein the step of providing the tables to the**

memory comprises providing the spreadsheets to the memory. (Column 10 Lines

64-66, discloses loading the data file into the Outgoing Data Box that is going to be

accessed by the server)

With respect to claim 7, Ogawa teaches:

Validating, prior to the step of entering, the data by comparing the data

with validation data in the database. (Column 4 Lines 33-37, discloses validating the

data to assess the correctness of it)

With respect to claim 16, Ogawa teaches:

A computer readable medium embodied with code segments for providing

data to a database, the computer readable medium comprising:

A code segment for receiving a request at a server from a client to

assemble data into a format that is in accord with rules of a software application;

(Column 11 Lines 17-23, discloses invoking the data transmission and reformatting

process)

A code segment for receiving, in response to the request from the to

assemble the data, the data at the server; (Column 11 Lines 42-50, discloses

transmitting the information from the client to the server)

A code segment for assembling the data into the format that is in accord

with rules of a software application; (Column 2 Lines 58-59, discloses translating the

data to the specific format needed by the software application) **and**

A code segment for entering the data that is in accord with rules of a

software application into a database. (Column 23 Lines 56-62, discloses storing the

formatted data in a database)

With respect to claim 17, Ogawa teaches:

The code segment for receiving comprises a code segment for receiving

the data as one-to-one tables from a memory accessible by both the server and a

client. (Column 10 Lines 59-61, discloses a field being uniquely representative to each

other field)

With respect to claim 18, Ogawa teaches:

A code segment for validating the data prior to the data, that is in accord

with rules of a software application, being entered into the database. (Column 4

Lines 33-37, discloses validating the data to assess the correctness of it)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6, 8-15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ogawa et al (US Patent 5,608,874) in view of Kremen et al (US

Patent 5,706,434).

With respect to claim 4:

Ogawa doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **sending a request to reformat**

the data comprises sending the request via an email from the client to the server.

Kremen teaches that **sending a request to reformat the data comprises**

sending the request via an email from the client to the server. (Columns 6-7 Lines

66-2, disclose sending a request to a server for data formatting via a plurality of

communication protocols including Simple Mail Transfer, making the communication

between the client and the server easier because of the use of already pre established

protocols)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement that **sending a**

request to reformat the data comprises sending the request via an email from the

client to the server because it would make the communication between the client and the server easier because of the use of already pre established protocols.

With respect to claim 5:

Ogawa teaches **authenticating a sender of the request to convert the data;** (Column 6 Lines 29-30, discloses a subscriber id that is going to be used to identify the authenticity of the request) **wherein the step of entering comprises entering the data in response to the step of authenticating producing a confirmation that the sender is authorized to enter the data in the database.** (Column 11 Lines 42-50, discloses transmitting the information from the client to the server, it would be inherent that if the subscriber id was authenticated then the data would be allowed to be entered in the database)

With respect to claim 6:

Ogawa teaches **authenticating the sender by comparing an email user name** (subscriber ID) **of the sender used in the email with a list of authorized users.** (Column 6 Lines 29-30, discloses a subscriber id that is going to be used to identify the authenticity of the request)

With respect to claim 8:

Ogawa teaches **receiving, at a server, a request from a client to assemble the data according to rules of a software application** (Column 11 Lines 17-23,

discloses invoking the data transmission and reformatting process); **receiving, in response to the request being received, the data from a memory accessible by both the server and a client;** (Column 11 Lines 42-50, discloses transmitting the information from the client to the server) **assembling the data into data formatted according to the rules of the software application;** (Column 2 Lines 58-59, discloses translating the data to the specific format needed by the software application) **and entering the data formatted according to rules of the software application in a database.** (Column 23 Lines 56-62, discloses storing the formatted data in a database)

Ogawa doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **the request is sent via email.**

Kremen teaches that **the request is sent via email.** (Columns 6-7 Lines 66-2, disclose sending a request to a server for data formatting via a plurality of communication protocols including Simple Mail Transfer, making the communication between the client and the server easier because of the use of already pre established protocols)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement that **the request is sent via email** because it would make the communication between the client and the server easier because of the use of already pre established protocols.

With respect to claim 9:

Ogawa teaches that **receiving the data comprises receiving the data as a collection of tables organized in a one-to-one relationship.** (Column 10 Lines 59-61, discloses a field being uniquely representative to each other field)

With respect to claim 10:

Ogawa teaches **receiving each of the tables in a collection of respective spreadsheets,** (Column 8 Lines 28-39, discloses using a spreadsheet for assembling the plurality of tables) **wherein the collection of spreadsheets are stored in a folder in the memory.** (Column 10 Lines 52-56, discloses that the data will be added to data files that will be stored in memory)

With respect to claim 11:

Ogawa teaches that **the data is project management data and the collection of tables comprises tables selected from the group consisting of: an activity information table, a resource information table, a relationship information table and a global activity code attribute table.** (Column 10 Lines 52-67, discloses the creation of the data to be format-ted, in the prior art there are no constraints into what kind of data could be included in the data file. Also the type of data in the data files will not affect the functionality of formatting the data)

With respect to claim 12:

Ogawa teaches **validating, prior to the step of entering the data, the data in the one-to-one tables.** (Column 4 Lines 33-37, discloses validating the data to assess the correctness of it)

With respect to claim 13:

Ogawa teaches **compiling an exception report during the step of validating; and providing the exception report to another folder in the memory.** (Column 3 Lines 2-3, discloses performing validation and creating exception reports)

With respect to claim 14:

Ogawa teaches **authenticating a sender of the request to assemble the data based upon an email address** (subscriber ID) **of the sender;** (Column 6 Lines 29-30, discloses a subscriber id that is going to be used to identify the authenticity of the request) **wherein the step of entering comprises entering the data in response to the step of authenticating producing a confirmation that the sender is authorized to update the database.** (Column 11 Lines 42-50, discloses transmitting the information from the client to the server, it would be inherent that if the subscriber id was authenticated then the data would be allowed to be entered in the database)

With respect to claim 15:

Ogawa teaches **assembling the data from a one-to-one format into a one-to-many format.** (Column 2 Lines 59-61, discloses that the data will be formatted to the format needed by the software application)

With respect to claim 19:

Ogawa doesn't appear to explicitly disclose that **the code segment for receiving a request at a server from a client comprises a code segment for receiving the request at the server via an email from the client.**

Kremen teaches that **the code segment for receiving a request at a server from a client comprises a code segment for receiving the request at the server via an email from the client.** (Columns 6-7 Lines 66-2, disclose sending a request to a server for data formatting via a plurality of communication protocols including Simple Mail Transfer, making the communication between the client and the server easier because of the use of already pre established protocols)

With respect to claim 20:

Ogawa teaches **a code segment for authenticating a sender of the request to assemble the data based upon an email address of the sender;** (Column 6 Lines 29-30, discloses a subscriber id that is going to be used to identify the authenticity of the request) **wherein the code segment for entering the data comprises a code segment for entering the data in response to the sender being authenticated by the code segment for authenticating.** (Column 11 Lines 42-50, discloses transmitting

the information from the client to the server, it would be inherent that if the subscriber id

was authenticated then the data would be allowed to be entered in the database)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mariela D. Reyes whose telephone number is (571)

270-1006. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 7:30- 5:00 East time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MR
3/13/07

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100